

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-5 are pending in this application. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 1 is independent.

**Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103(a)**

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the present disclosed admitted prior art in view of Costa (U.S. Patent 6,438,832) and Sward (U.S. Patent 6,439,900). The subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a shared electrical and optical transmission equipment of a plug-and-jack type comprising, among other things, a main body (e.g., 13) which contains an insertion port (e.g., 12) for selectively receiving either of a round optical plug or a single-prong electrical plug, a pair of identification terminals (e.g., 16 and 17) which make mutual contact when pushed by either of the round optical plug or the single-prong electrical plug inserted in the insertion port of the main body, each of the pair of identification terminals having a connection portion to connect to an external device as well as a contact portion (Figures 5 and 6: 16a or 17a, respectively) to make contact with the other identification terminal, the connection portion being plated at least with solder and the contact portion being plated with gold, each of the pair of identification terminals is entirely plated with solder, and

additionally plated with gold exclusively at the contact portion (specification at para. 0026).

Based on the above features of the present invention, the Gold plating is kept to a minimum yet reduces contact resistance at the contact portion (page 11, lines 7-12), and the solder-plating ensures good solderability (page 11, para. 0027).

The Office Action relies on Sward for teaching gold plating of the contact portion of a terminal.

Sward does appear to mention that it is known to plate copper with gold, but only in a section that discusses problems with using gold as a plating material. Sward states that, "Those familiar with plating processes appreciate the various undesirable side-effects of plating and particularly gold plating on small dimension electronic printed circuit boards." (column 2, lines 12-14). Sward goes on to explain various examples of problems with using Gold as a plating material (column 2, lines 15-31). Furthermore, Sward merely teaches plating gold directly to the underlying conductive material, e.g. copper. An improvement disclosed by Sward is to use a non-metallic sealant on a slidably receiving contact (Abstract).

The reference Costa was relied on for teaching coating an electrical terminal with solder (column 1, lines 56-60; and column 2, lines 59-61).

Thus, Applicant submits that Sward and Costa, in addition to the applicants own disclosed prior art, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the claimed terminals entirely plated with solder and

additionally plated with gold exclusively at the contact portion. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 1-5.

Furthermore, as a flash plate is thinner than a gold plate, *per se*, Applicant submits that no evidence has been provided to show the structure of claim 3 of additionally flash plating with gold at the contact portion of each identification terminal. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established for at least the features of claim 3.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 10/649,822

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By  (reg. #40,417)  
for Terrell C. Birch, #19,382

RWD  
TCB/RWD/ph  
0951-0124P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000